# Global existence of weak solutions of a model for electrolyte solutions – Part 2: Multicomponent case

Matthias Herz[1] and Peter Knabner[1]

[1]*Department of Mathematics, University of Erlangen-Nürnberg, Cauerstr. 11, D-91058 Erlangen, Germany*

May 24, 2016

**Abstract**

This paper analytically investigates the Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck system. This system is a mathematical model for electrolyte solutions. In this paper, we consider electrolyte solutions, which consist of a neutral fluid and multiple suspended charged chemical species with arbitrary valencies. We prove global existence and uniqueness of weak solutions in two space dimensions.

**Keywords:** Global existence, electrolyte solution, electrohydrodynamics, Moser iteration, generalized Schauder fixed point theorem, Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck system.

## 1 Introduction

From the introduction of Part 1 of this work, we know that many complicated phenomena in hydrodynamics and biology can be modeled as electrolyte solutions, as these models simultaneously capture the following three ubiquitous processes: (i) The transport of the charged particles, (ii) the hydrodynamic fluid flow, (iii) the electrostatics.

Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck systems are classical models for electrolyte solutions in case of laminar flow in porous media. A detailed derivation of these systems are given in [3, 12, 18, 22–25, 29, 30, 32]. In Part 1 of this work, we mentioned, that among many others, mathematical models for electrolyte solutions have been investigated analytically in [6, 9, 11, 13–17, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 34].

In particular, existence of solutions for electrolyte solutions, which contain multiple charged solutes, were proven amongst others in [6, 9, 15, 26, 27]. More precisely, the authors of [6] proved local in time existence for a fluid-particle system. The existence results of [26, 27] were proven under the additional assumption of a volume-additivity constraint and by including an additional reaction force term in the transport equations. These additional assumptions allow to bypass in [26, 27] the below mentioned serious difficulties. [9] dealt with a stationary system and in [15], existence in two dimensions was established for electrolyte solution at rest, which may involve nonlocal constraints in the equation for the electrostatic potential.

In case of multiple charged chemical species with arbitrary valencies, the main difficulty is to prove a priori estimates for the chemical species, which are valid on arbitrary large time intervals and which are independently of the electric field. We briefly sketch this difficulty by firstly considering the case of two oppositely charged species $c_1$ (positively charged) and $c_2$ (negatively charged) with valencies $z_1 > 0 > z_2$. In Part 1 of this work, we proposed to use in the proof of a priori estimates for $c_l$ the weighted test functions $\varphi = |z_l|\, c_l$. Together with Gauss's law, i.e. $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \boldsymbol{E} = z_1 c_1 - |z_2|\, c_2$, we thereby obtained the following pointwise sign condition for the sum of the "electric drift integrals", which describe the

electrophoretic motion of the $c_l$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-2\sum_l (z_l c_l \boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{\nabla}(|z_l|\, c_l)\,)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \Big(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{E}, (z_1 c_1)^2 - (|z_2|\, c_2)^2\Big)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \Big(z_1 c_1 - |z_2|\, c_2, (z_1 c_1)^2 - (|z_2|\, c_2)^2\Big)_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq 0, \;\; \text{as } [a-b]\left[a^2-b^2\right] \geq 0 \;\; \text{for } a,b \geq 0\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Due to this pointwise sign condition, we omitted the sum of the "electric drift integrals" in the proof of a priori estimates for the chemical species $c_l$. However, in the multicomponent case, i.e., in case of of $L \in \mathbb{N}$ charged solutes $c_l$ with arbitrary valencies $z_l$, the corresponding sum of these integrals reads with Gauss's law $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{E} = \sum_l z_l c_l$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-2\sum_l (\mathsf{sign}(z_l)\,|z_l|\, c_l \boldsymbol{E}\;,\; \boldsymbol{\nabla}(|z_l|\, c_l)\,)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \left(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{E}\;,\; \sum_l \mathsf{sign}(z_l))(|z_l|\, c_l)^2\right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= \left(\sum_l \mathsf{sign}(z_l)\,|z_l|\, c_l\;,\; \sum_l \mathsf{sign}(z_l)(|z_l|\, c_l)^2\right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \qquad \Longleftrightarrow\colon\; I.1 = I.2 = I.3.
\end{aligned}
$$

It is easy to show that $I.3$ does not satisfy a pointwise sign condition[1]. Thus, we now have to estimate one of the integrals $I.1$–$I.3$ by suitable norms of the integrands. This can easily be done with standard arguments. More precisely, we obtain with Hölder's inequality, Gagliardo-Nirenberg's inequality, and Young's inequalitythe estimates (space dimension $n = 2, 3$)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(a)\;\; I.3 \leq C\sum_l \|c_l\|^3_{L^3(\Omega)} \leq \delta \sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta^{-1} C \sum_l \|c_l\|^6_{L^2(\Omega)}\;\;, \\
&(b)\;\; I.2 \leq \delta \sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta^{-1} C\, \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{E}\|^{4/(4-n)}_{L^2(\Omega)} \sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\,, \\
&(c)\;\; I.1 \leq \delta \sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \delta^{-1} C\, \|\boldsymbol{E}\|^4_{L^6(\Omega)} \sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\;\;.
\end{aligned}
$$

Provided we have an a priori bound for the electric field or its divergence, which is independent of $c_l$, we are done by choosing one of the estimates $(b)$ or $(c)$. However, in Poisson–Nernst–Planck systems the equations for the electric field and its divergence depend on $c_l$, which leads to the a priori bound $\|\boldsymbol{E}\|_{L^6(\Omega)} + \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{E}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\sum_l \|c_l\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Substituting this bound into $(b)$ or $(c)$ shows that these estimates lead to $(a)$. Finally, the proof of a priori estimates for $c_l$ in combination with $(a)$ results in

$$
\frac{d}{dt}\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C\sum_l \|c_l\|^6_{L^2(\Omega)}\;\;.
$$

Hence, we can not apply the standard version of Gronwall's inequality, which we need to obtain a uniform a priori bound from the preceding equation. In fact, we just have a nonlinear version due to Willett-Wong, cf. [33], which is in our case applicable just on a very small time interval, cf. [5, Theorem 4.9]. An iterative application of this nonlinear Gronwall's inequality does not lead to an extension to arbitrary large time intervals$[0, T_0]$, as the constants may blow up in finite time.

In this paper, we propose to substitute Gauss's law $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{E} = \sum_l z_l c_l =: \rho_f$ into the above estimate $(b)$. Thereby, estimate $(b)$ reads as

$$
I.2 \leq \delta \sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} + \delta^{-1} C\, \|\rho_f\|^{4/(4-n)}_{L^2(\Omega)} \sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\;\;.
$$

It now remains to show a uniform bound for $\rho_f$ in $L^{4/(4-n)}\big(I; L^2(\Omega)\big)$, which is the crucial task in the current chapter. We successfully establish such a uniform bound by means of entropy estimates,

[1] Consider, e.g., three chemical species with valencies $z_1 = z_2 = 1$, $z_3 = -1$. Assume that the values at a given point in space and time are $c_1 = c_2 = 1$, $c_3 = \sqrt{3}$. This gives $(1 + 1 - \sqrt{3})(1 + 1 - 3) = -(2 - \sqrt{3}) < 0$.

which lead to bounds for certain Lyapunov functions and which have been previously used in a different context, e.g., in [19]. However, these techniques lead to a uniform bound for $\rho_f$ in $L^2\left(I; L^2(\Omega)\right)$. This is the reason why the presented existence result is restricted to two space dimensions.

The contribution of this paper is to show in two space dimensions the global existence, uniqueness, and boundedness of weak solutions for electrolyte solutions that consist of a neutral fluid and multiple charged solutes with arbitrary valencies. Due to the entropy estimates we can avoid further restrictions, such as the electroneutralitiy constraint, cf. [3], or the volume-additivity constraint, cf. [26]. Thus, the presented results apply to two dimensional models of general electrolyte solutions, which are captured by the Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck system.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we present the model equations and we prove that solutions are unique. In Section 3, we introduce the fixed point method, and in Section 4.1, we prove the crucial a priori estimates. Finally, in Section 4.2, we show the global existence. Note, that we omit several proofs in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2, as we wrote Part 1 of this work such that it allows us to copy the coinciding parts of the proof.

# 2 Model Equations

Henceforth, we use the notation (N1)–(N4), which we already introduced in Part 1 of this work. Furthermore, in Part 1 of this work, we pointed out that Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck systems consist of the following three coupled conservation laws:

**Law 1 – Gauss's law**

$$\mathcal{E}^{-1}\boldsymbol{E} = -\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Phi \qquad \text{in } \Omega_T, \tag{2.1a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{E} = \rho_f + \rho_b \qquad \text{in } \Omega_T, \tag{2.1b}$$

$$\rho_f = \theta\sum_l z_l c_l \qquad \text{in } \Omega_T, \tag{2.1c}$$

$$\boldsymbol{E}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nu} = \sigma \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_T, \tag{2.1d}$$

**Law 2 – Darcy's law**

$$\mathcal{K}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u} = \mu^{-1}\left(-\boldsymbol{\nabla}p + \mathcal{E}^{-1}\rho_f\boldsymbol{E}\right) \qquad \text{in } \Omega_T, \tag{2.1e}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{u} = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega_T, \tag{2.1f}$$

$$\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nu} = f \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_T. \tag{2.1g}$$

**Law 3 – Nernst-Planck equations**

$$\theta\partial_t c_l + \boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\left(\mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\nabla}c_l + c_l[\boldsymbol{u} + ez_l(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1}\boldsymbol{E}]\right) = \theta R_l(\boldsymbol{c}) \qquad \text{in } \Omega_T, \tag{2.1h}$$

$$\left(\mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\nabla}c_l + c_l[\boldsymbol{u} + ez_l(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1}\boldsymbol{E}]\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nu} = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_T, \tag{2.1i}$$

$$c_l(0) = c_{0,l} \qquad \text{on } \Omega. \tag{2.1j}$$

**Remark 2.1.** The homogeneous boundary flux in equation (2.1i), can be equivalently expressed with equations (2.1d) and (2.1g) by

$$(\mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\nabla}c_l)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nu} = -c_l f - (\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} e z_l c_l \sigma \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_T\ .$$

Thus, the homogeneous boundary flux condition is equivalent to a homogeneous Robin boundary condition for the diffusion part. □

## 2.1 Weak formulation of the model

Firstly, we introduce the required notation for the analytical investigations.

(N5) **Spaces:** For $k > 0$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, we denote the Lebesgue spaces for scalar-valued and vector-valued functions by $L^p(\Omega)$ and the respective Sobolev spaces by $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$, cf. [2]. Furthermore, we set $H^k(\Omega) := W^{k,2}(\Omega)$ and we refer for the definition of the Bochner spaces $L^p(I;V)$, $H^k(I;V)$ over a Banach space $V$ to [28]. The $H^k_f(\mathrm{div};\Omega)$-spaces are defined, e.g., in [8] by $H^k_f(\mathrm{div};\Omega) := \left\{ \boldsymbol{v} \in H^k(\Omega) : \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{v} \in H^k(\Omega), \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \nu = f \text{ on } \Gamma \right\}$.

(N6) **Products:** We denote by $(\cdot\ ,\ \cdot)_H$ the inner product on a Hilbert space $H$ and by $\langle \cdot\ ,\ \cdot \rangle_{V^* \times V}$, the dual pairing between a Banach space $V$ and its dual space $V^*$. On $\mathbb{R}^n$, we just write $\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{u} := (\boldsymbol{v}\ ,\ \boldsymbol{u})_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ and on $L^2\left(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d\right)$, we just denote $(\cdot\ ,\ \cdot)_\Omega := (\cdot\ ,\ \cdot)_{L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)}$. In particular the dual pairing between $H^1(\Omega)$ and its dual $H^1(\Omega)^*$, we abbreviate by $\langle \cdot\ ,\ \cdot \rangle_{1,\Omega} := \langle \cdot\ ,\ \cdot \rangle_{H^1(\Omega)^* \times H^1(\Omega)}$.

Secondly, we henceforth impose the following assumptions:

(A1) **Geometry:** Let $n = 2$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, i.e. $\Gamma \in C^{0,1}$.

(A2) **Initial data:** The initial data $c_{0,l}$ are non negative and bounded, i.e., $0 \leq c_{0,l}(x) \leq M_0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ for some $M_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

(A3) **Ellipticity:** The diffusivity tensor $\mathcal{D}$ and the permeability tensor $\mathcal{K}$ satisfy $\mathcal{D}\xi \cdot \xi > \alpha_D |\xi|^2$ and $\mathcal{K}^{-1}\xi \cdot \xi > \alpha_K |\xi|^2$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathcal{D}\xi \cdot \eta < C_D |\xi| |\eta|$ and $\mathcal{K}^{-1}\xi \cdot \eta < C_K |\xi| |\eta|$ for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

(A4) **Coefficients:** The porosity $\theta$, the dynamic viscosity $\mu$, and the electric permittivity $\epsilon$ are positive constants.

(A5) **Reaction rates:** The reaction rate functions $R_l : \mathbb{R}^L \to \mathbb{R}$ are global Lipschitz continuous functions, i.e., $R_l \in C^{0,1}\left(\mathbb{R}^L\right)$ with Lipschitz constant $C_{R_l}$. Furthermore, we assume $R_l(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and $R_l(v_1, \ldots, v_l, \ldots, v_L) \geq 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^L$ with $v_l \leq 0$. This means, in case a chemical species vanishes, it can only be produced.

(A6) **Boundary data:** We assume $\sigma \in L^\infty(\Omega_T)$ and $f \in L^\infty(\Omega_T)$. Furthermore, we suppose that functions $\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in L^\infty\left(I; W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)\right)$ with $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = \sigma$ and $\boldsymbol{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = f$ exist.

(A7) **Background charge density:** We assume $\rho_b \in L^\infty(\Omega_T)$.

Thirdly, we define the weak formulation of the Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck system.

**Definition 2.2** (Weak solution)**.** *The vector $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$ is a weak solution of the Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck system* (2.1a)–(2.1j)*, if and only if*

*(i)* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi) \in L^\infty(I; H_\sigma(\mathrm{div};\Omega)) \times L^\infty\left(I; L^2(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}\right)$ *solve for all* $(\boldsymbol{v}, \varphi) \in H_0(\mathrm{div};\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$

$$\left(\mathcal{E}^{-1}\boldsymbol{E}\ ,\ \boldsymbol{v}\right)_\Omega = \left(\Phi\ ,\ \boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot \boldsymbol{v}\right)_\Omega \tag{2.2a}$$

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot \boldsymbol{E}\ ,\ \varphi\right)_\Omega = \left(\rho_b + \rho_f\ ,\ \varphi\right)_\Omega . \tag{2.2b}$$

*(ii)* $(\boldsymbol{u}, p) \in L^\infty\left(I; H_f(\mathrm{div};\Omega)\right) \times L^\infty\left(I; L^2(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}\right)$ *solve for all* $(\boldsymbol{v}, \varphi) \in H_0(\mathrm{div};\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$

$$\left(\mathcal{K}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}\ ,\ \boldsymbol{v}\right)_\Omega = \left(\mu^{-1}p\ ,\ \boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot \boldsymbol{v}\right)_\Omega + \left(\mu^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{-1}\rho_f \boldsymbol{E}\ ,\ \boldsymbol{v}\right)_\Omega , \tag{2.2c}$$

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot \boldsymbol{u}\ ,\ \varphi\right)_\Omega = 0 . \tag{2.2d}$$

*(iii)* $c_l \in L^\infty\left(I; L^2(\Omega)\right) \cap L^2\left(I; H^1(\Omega)\right) \cap H^1\left(I; H^1(\Omega)^*\right) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_T)$ *solves for all* $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ *and for* $l = 1, ..., L$

$$\langle \theta \partial_t c_l\ ,\ \varphi \rangle_{1,\Omega} + \left(\mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l\ ,\ \boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi\right)_\Omega - \left(c_l[\boldsymbol{u} + ez_l(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1}\boldsymbol{E}]\ ,\ \boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi\right)_\Omega = \left(\theta R_l(\boldsymbol{c})\ ,\ \varphi\right)_\Omega , \tag{2.2e}$$

*and $c_l$ take its initial values in the sense that*

$$\lim_{t \searrow 0} \left(c_l(t) - c_{0,l}\ ,\ \varphi\right)_\Omega = 0 \qquad \textit{for all } \varphi \in L^2(\Omega) .$$

□

**Remark 2.3.** As already showed in Part 1 of this work, equations (2.2e) are not well-defined without having $c_l \in L^\infty(\Omega_T)$. Thus $c_l \in L^\infty(\Omega_T)$ is mandatory for a well-defined weak formulation. □

### 2.2 Uniqueness

We note that we can skip some of the following proofs, as we wrote Part 1 of this work such that we can directly copy some proofs.

**Theorem 2.4** (Uniqueness)**.** *Let (A1)–(A7) be valid and let* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$ *be a weak solution of* (2.1a)–(2.1j) *according to Definition 2.2. Then,* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c})$ *is unique.*

*Proof.* The proof is identical to the corresponding proof of Part 1 of this work. Furthermore, the proof holds even in three space dimensions. □

## 3 Fixed Point Operator

We apply the same fixed point approach as already used in Part 1 of this work. For more details concerning this approach, we refer to Part 1 of this work.

**Definition 3.1** (Fixed point operator)**.** *Let* $K \subset X$ *be a subset of the Banach space* $X$*, which is given by* $X := \left[L^\infty\left(I; L^2(\Omega)\right) \cap L^2\left(I; H^1(\Omega)\right) \cap H^1\left(I; H^1(\Omega)^*\right) \cap L^\infty(\Omega_T)\right]^L$*. We introduce the fixed point operator* $\mathcal{F}$ *by*

$$\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_3 \circ \mathcal{F}_2 \circ \mathcal{F}_1 : K \subset X \to X \, .$$

*Herein, the suboperator* $\mathcal{F}_1$ *is defined by*

$$\mathcal{F}_1 : \begin{cases} K \to X \times L^\infty(I; H_\sigma(\mathrm{div}; \Omega)) \times L^\infty\left(I; L^2(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}\right) =: Y \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{c}} \mapsto (\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}, \boldsymbol{E}, \Phi), \quad \text{with } (\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi) \text{ solving for all } (\boldsymbol{v}, \varphi) \in H_0(\mathrm{div}; \Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \end{cases}$$

$$\left(\mathcal{E}^{-1}\boldsymbol{E} \, , \, \boldsymbol{v}\right)_\Omega = (\Phi \, , \, \boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \boldsymbol{v})_\Omega \, , \tag{3.1a}$$

$$(\boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \boldsymbol{E} \, , \, \varphi)_\Omega = (\rho_b + \bar{\rho}_f \, , \, \varphi)_\Omega \, , \tag{3.1b}$$

*with* $\rho_f$ *defined ind* (2.1c) .

*Furthermore, the suboperator* $\mathcal{F}_2$ *is defined by*

$$\mathcal{F}_2 : \begin{cases} Y \quad \to Y \times L^\infty\left(I; H_f(\mathrm{div}; \Omega)\right) \times L^\infty\left(I; L^2(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}\right) =: Z \\ (\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}, \boldsymbol{E}, \Phi) \mapsto (\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}, \boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p), \quad \text{with } (\boldsymbol{u}, p) \text{ solving for all } (\boldsymbol{v}, \varphi) \in H_0(\mathrm{div}; \Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \end{cases}$$

$$\left(\mathcal{K}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u} \, , \, \boldsymbol{v}\right)_\Omega = \left(\mu^{-1} p \, , \, \boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}\right)_\Omega + \left(\mu^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{-1}\bar{\rho}_f \boldsymbol{E} \, , \, \boldsymbol{v}\right)_\Omega , \tag{3.1c}$$

$$(\boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \boldsymbol{u} \, , \, \varphi)_\Omega = 0. \tag{3.1d}$$

*Finally, the suboperator* $\mathcal{F}_3$ *is defined by*

$$\mathcal{F}_3 : \begin{cases} Z \quad \to X \\ (\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}, \boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p) \mapsto \boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, c_2), \quad \text{with } c_l \text{ solving for all } \varphi \in H^1(\Omega) \text{ and } l = 1, \ldots, L \end{cases}$$

$$\langle \theta \partial_t c_l \, , \, \varphi \rangle_{1,\Omega} + (\mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l \, , \, \boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi)_\Omega - \left(c_l[\boldsymbol{u} + e z_l (\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} \boldsymbol{E}] \, , \, \boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi\right)_\Omega$$

$$= (\theta R_l(\boldsymbol{c}) \, , \, \varphi)_\Omega \, , \tag{3.1e}$$

*and* $c_l$ *take its initial values in the sense that*

$$\lim_{t \searrow 0} (c_l(t) - c_{0,l} \, , \, \varphi)_\Omega \; = \; 0 \qquad \text{for all } \varphi \in L^2(\Omega) \; .$$

□

**Lemma 3.2** (well-definedness)**.** *Let (A1)–(A7) be valid. Then, the operator* $\mathcal{F} : K \subset X \to X$ *defined in Definition 3.1, is well-defined.*

*Proof.* The proof is identical to the corresponding proof of Part 1 of this work. Furthermore, the proof holds even in three space dimensions. □

**Lemma 3.3** (regularity for Gauss's law)**.** *Let (A1)–(A7) be valid and let* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$ *be a solution of* (2.1a)–(2.1j) *according to Definition 3.1. Then, for the partial solution* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi)$*, we have*

$$\Phi \in L^\infty\big(I; H^2(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}\big) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \boldsymbol{E} \in L^\infty\big(I; H^1(\Omega)\big) \ .$$

*Proof.* The proof is identical to the corresponding proof of Part 1 of this work. Furthermore, the proof holds even in three space dimensions. □

# 4 Existence for multicomponent electrolytes

In this section, we prove that global weak solutions of the Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck system exist.

## 4.1 A priori Estimates

We now show a priori bounds for the solution vector $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$. First of all, we cite some preliminary results, which we use in the subsequent calculations.

**Lemma 4.1** (Boundary Interpolation)**.** *Let* $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ *and suppose (A1). Then, we have*

$$\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma)} \ \leq \ \delta \, \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\delta^{-1} \, \|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \qquad \text{for all } \delta \in (0,1) \ .$$

*Proof.* The stated inequality follows immediately from [1, Theorem 7.58], [1, Lemma 7.16], and Young's inequality. □

**Lemma 4.2** (Approximation)**.** *Let* $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ *be an interval and let* $u \in L^2\big(I; H^1(\Omega)\big) \cap H^1\big(I; H^1(\Omega)^*\big)$*. Then, there exists a sequence* $(u_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0} \subset C^1\big(I; H^1(\Omega)\big)$ *such that we have*

$$\|u - u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(I;H^1(\Omega))} + \|u - u_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(I;H^1(\Omega)^*)} + \|u - u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} \ \to \ 0 \ .$$

*Proof.* See [28, Lemma 7.2, Lemma 7.3]. □

**Lemma 4.3** (Lyapunov function)**.** *Define the Lyapunov function* $\Lambda(x) : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ *by*

$$\Lambda(x) := x(\ln(x) - 1) + e \qquad \Longrightarrow \ \Lambda'(x) = \ln(x) \ .$$

*Then, we have*

$$\Lambda(x) - x \geq 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Lambda(x) \geq 0 \ .$$

*Proof.* The second inequality follows with $x \geq 0$ from the first one. For the first inequality calculate the minimum of the function $\Lambda(x) - x$. This shows $\min_{x\geq 0}(\Lambda(x) - x) = 0$. □

**Remark 4.4.** We call the function $\Lambda(x)$ a Lyapunov function, since for the heat equation $\partial_t u - \Delta u = 0$ in weak formulation, we easily obtain by formally testing with $\ln(u)$ the estimate

$$\|\Lambda(u(t))\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \ \leq \ \|\Lambda(u(0))\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \ .$$

Hence, the function $t \mapsto \|\Lambda(u(t))\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ is non-increasing along every trajectory $t \mapsto u(t)$. From the theory of ordinary differential equations, we know that functions with this property are called Lyapunov functions, cf. [4].

In the theory of partial differential equations, the Lyapunov function $\Lambda(x)$ occurs naturally in estimates that are based on testing with the logarithm of the solution. These estimates are called entropy estimates, cf. [10], as in many situations, we can physically interpret for a solution $u$ the logarithm $\ln(u)$ as entropy, cf. [20]. For that reason, the estimates in Lemma 4.6 are called entropy estimates.

Lyapunov functions of the type $\Lambda(x)$ have been used in [19] in the context of reaction-diffusion systems with reaction rates according to mass-action law. □

Next, we repeat a short result from Part 1 of this work

**Lemma 4.5** (Non negativity)**.** *Let (A1)–(A7) be valid and let* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$ *be a weak solution of* (2.1a)–(2.1j) *according to Definition 3.1. Then, we have for* $l \in \{1, \dots, L\}$

$$c_l(t,x) \geq 0 \quad \textit{for a.e. } t \in [0,T_0], \ \textit{a.e. } x \in \Omega \ .$$

*Proof.* The proof is identical to the corresponding proof of Part 1 of this work. Furthermore, the proof holds even in three space dimensions. □

We now prove the entropy estimates. Note, that these estimates continue to hold even for three space dimensions.

**Lemma 4.6** (Entropy estimates)**.** *Let (A1)–(A7) be valid and let* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$ *be a solution of the system* (2.1a)–(2.1j) *according to Definition 3.1. Then, we have the estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\rho}_f\|_{L^2(I;L^2(\Omega))} &\leq C_L(T_0) \ , \\ \sum_l \|\sqrt{c_l}\|^2_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l}\|_{L^2(I;L^2(\Omega))} &\leq C_L(T_0) \ . \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let $a > 0$. We test equations (3.1e) with $\varphi := \ln(c_l + a) \in H^1(\Omega)$, we sum over $l$ and we integrate in time over $[0, t_1] \in [0, T_0]$. For ease of readability, we split the following proof into two cases.

Case 1: $c_l = \bar{c}_l$ For the sum of the time integrals, we obtain with Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_l \langle \partial_t c_l \ , \ \ln(c_l + a) \rangle_{L^2(0,t_1;H^1(\Omega)^*)\times L^2(0,t_1;H^1(\Omega))} \\ &= \sum_l \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_0^{t_1} \int_\Omega \partial_t (c_{l,\varepsilon} + a) \ln(c_{l,\varepsilon} + a) \, dxdt \ = \sum_l \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_0^{t_1} \int_\Omega \partial_t \Lambda(c_{l,\varepsilon} + a) \, dxdt \\ &= \sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l(t_1) + a)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - \sum_l \|\Lambda(c_{0,l} + a)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \ . \end{aligned}$$

For the sum of the diffusion integrals, we immediately get with (A3)

$$\sum_l \left( \mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l \ , \ \frac{1}{c_l + a} \boldsymbol{\nabla}(c_l + a) \right)_{\Omega\times[0,t_1]} \geq \alpha_D \sum_l \left\| \boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l + a} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} \ .$$

The sum of the convection integrals, we transform with integration by parts and equation (3.1d) to

$$\begin{aligned} I_{co} &:= -\sum_l (c_l \boldsymbol{u} \ , \ \boldsymbol{\nabla}\ln(c_l + a))_{\Omega\times[0,t_1]} \\ &= -\sum_l ((c_l + a)\boldsymbol{u} \ , \ \boldsymbol{\nabla}\ln(c_l + a))_{\Omega\times[0,t_1]} - a\sum_l (\boldsymbol{u} \ , \ \boldsymbol{\nabla}\ln(c_l + a))_{\Omega\times[0,t_1]} \\ &= -\sum_l (f \ , \ c_l + a)_{\Gamma\times[0,t_1]} - \sum_l (f \ , \ a\ln(c_l + a))_{\Gamma\times[0,t_1]} \ =: A.1 + A.2 \ . \end{aligned}$$

Applying Hölder's inequality Lemma 4.1, and Lemma 4.3 leads for the integral $I.1$ to

$$\begin{aligned} A.1 &\geq -\sum_l \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \|c_l + a\|_{L^1(\Gamma\times[0,t_1])} \ = -\sum_l \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \left\|\sqrt{c_l + a}\right\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma\times[0,t_1])} \\ &\geq -\delta \sum_l \left\| \boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l + a} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} - 2\delta^{-1} \|f\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \sum_l \left\|\sqrt{c_l + a}\right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} \\ &= -\delta \sum_l \left\| \boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l + a} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} - 2\delta^{-1} \|f\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \sum_l \|c_l + a\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} \\ &\geq -\delta \sum_l \left\| \boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l + a} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} - 2\delta^{-1} \|f\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l + a)\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} \ . \end{aligned}$$

This yields for the sum of the convection integrals

$$\begin{aligned} I_{co} \geq & -\delta \sum_l \left\| \boldsymbol{\nabla} \sqrt{c_l + a} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega \times [0,t_1])} - 2\delta^{-1} \left\| f \right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \sum_l \left\| \Lambda(c_l + a) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega \times [0,t_1])} \\ & - \sum_l \left( f \ , \ a \ln(c_l + a) \right)_{\Gamma \times [0,t_1]} . \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we transform the sum of the electric drift integrals with integration by parts and equation (3.1b) to

$$\begin{aligned} I_{el} := & - \sum_l \left( c_l e z_l (\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} \boldsymbol{E} \ , \ \boldsymbol{\nabla} \ln(c_l + a) \right)_{\Omega \times [0,t_1]} \\ & = -e(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} \sum_l \left( \boldsymbol{E} \ , \ z_l \boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l \right)_{\Omega \times [0,t_1]} - a \sum_l e z_l (\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} \left( \boldsymbol{E} \ , \ z_l \boldsymbol{\nabla} \ln(c_l + a) \right)_{\Omega \times [0,t_1]} \\ & = e(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} \left( \rho_f \ , \ \rho_f \right)_{\Omega \times [0,t_1]} \ - \ e(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} \left( \sigma \ , \ \rho_f \right)_{\Gamma \times [0,t_1]} \\ & \quad + \sum_l e z_l (\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} \Big[ \left( \rho_f \ , \ a \ln(c_l + a) \right)_{\Omega \times [0,t_1]} - \left( \sigma \ , \ a \ln(c_l + a) \right)_{\Gamma \times [0,t_1]} \Big] \\ & =: \ B.1 + B.2 + B.3. \end{aligned}$$

Exactly as we treated the integral $A.1$, we come for the integral $B.2$ to

$$\begin{aligned} B.2 = & -e(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} \sum_l \left( \sigma \ , \ z_l c_l \right)_{\Gamma \times [0,t_1]} \ \geq - \frac{e \max_l |z_l|}{\epsilon k_b T} \sum_l \left( |\sigma| \ , \ |c_l + a| \right)_{\Gamma \times [0,t_1]} \\ & \geq - \frac{e \max_l |z_l|}{\epsilon k_b T} \left\| \sigma \right\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \left\| \sqrt{c_l + a} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma \times [0,t_1])} \\ & \geq -\delta \sum_l \left\| \boldsymbol{\nabla} \sqrt{c_l + a} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega \times [0,t_1])} - \frac{2e^2 \max_l |z_l|^2}{\delta (\epsilon k_b T)^2} \left\| \sigma \right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \sum_l \left\| \Lambda(c_l + a) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega \times [0,t_1])} . \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we arrive for the sum of the electric drift integrals at

$$\begin{aligned} I_{el} \geq & \, e(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1} \left\| \rho_f \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega \times [0,t_1])} - \frac{2e^2 \max_l |z_l|^2}{\delta (\epsilon k_b T)^2} \left\| \sigma \right\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} \sum_l \left\| \Lambda(c_l + a) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega \times [0,t_1])} \\ & - \delta \sum_l \left\| \boldsymbol{\nabla} \sqrt{c_l + a} \right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega \times [0,t_1])} + \sum_l \frac{e z_l}{\epsilon k_b T} \left[ \left( \rho_f \ , \ a \ln(c_l + a) \right)_\Omega - \left( \sigma \ , \ a \ln(c_l + a) \right)_\Gamma \right] . \end{aligned}$$

The remaining sum of the reaction integrals, we estimate with Lemma 4.3 and $c_l \geq 0$ according to Lemma 4.5 by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_l \left( R_l(\boldsymbol{c}) \ , \ \ln(c_l + a) \right)_{\Omega \times [0,t_1]} \ \leq \max_l C_{R_l} \sum_l \left( \frac{|\boldsymbol{c}|}{(c_l + a)} \ , \ (c_l + a) \ln(c_l + a) \right)_{\Omega \times [0,t_1]} \\ & \leq \max_l C_{R_l} \sum_l \left( \frac{|\boldsymbol{c}|}{(c_l + a)} \ , \ \Lambda(c_l + a) \right)_{\Omega \times [0,t_1]} \\ & \leq \max_l C_{R_l} \left( \frac{|\boldsymbol{c}|}{\sum_l (c_l + a)} \ , \ \sum_k \Lambda(c_k + a) \right)_{\Omega \times [0,t_1]} \leq \max_l C_{R_l} \sum_l \left\| \Lambda(c_l + a) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega \times [0,t_1])} . \end{aligned}$$

Combining the preceding estimates leads with a suitable choice of the free parameter $\delta > 0$ to the

intermediate inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l(t_1)+a)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \frac{\alpha_D}{2}\sum_l \left\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l+a}\right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} + \frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T}\|\rho_f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])}\\
&\le \sum_l \|\Lambda(c_{0,l}+a)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \frac{8}{\alpha_D}\|f\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l+a)\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])}\\
&\quad + \frac{8e^2\max_l|z_l|^2}{\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2}\|\sigma\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l+a)\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} + \sum_l (f\ ,\ a\ln(c_l+a))_{\Gamma\times[0,t_1]}\\
&\quad - \sum_l e z_l(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1}\left[\ (\rho_f\ ,\ a\ln(c_l+a))_{\Omega\times[0,t_1]} - (\sigma\ ,\ a\ln(c_l+a))_{\Gamma\times[0,t_1]}\ \right]\\
&\quad + \max_l C_{R_l}\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l+a)\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

We now can safely let $a \searrow 0$. Thereby, we obtain with $a\ln(c_l+a)\to 0$ the entropy estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l(t_1))\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \frac{\alpha_D}{2}\sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} + \frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T}\|\rho_f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])}\\
&\le \sum_l \|\Lambda(c_{0,l})\|_{L^1(\Omega)}\\
&\quad + \underbrace{\frac{8}{\alpha_D}\|f\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + \frac{8e^2\max_l|z_l|^2}{\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2}\|\sigma\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + \max_l C_{R_l}}_{=:b}\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l)\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality leads immediately to

$$\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l)\|_{L^\infty(I;L^1(\Omega))} \le \left[1+bT_0e^{bT_0}\right]\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_{0,l})\|_{L^1(\Omega)} =: \tilde{C}_L(T_0).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\|\rho_f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} \le \frac{\epsilon k_b T}{e}\left[1+b\tilde{C}_L(T_0)\right]\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_{0,l})\|_{L^1(\Omega)} =: C_{L,1}.$$

From this bound, we deduce with Lemma 4.3

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_l \|\sqrt{c_l}\|^2_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} + \frac{\alpha_D}{2}\sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])}\\
&\le \frac{2}{\alpha_D}\left[1+b\tilde{C}_L(T_0)\right]\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_{0,l})\|_{L^1(\Omega)} =: C_{L,2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we define the constant $C_L = C_L(T_0)$ by $C_L := 2\max(C_{L,1}, C_{L,2})$.

Case 2: $c_l \neq \bar{c}_l$ Concerning the first stated estimate, we assume that $\bar{c}_l$ is contained in a ball in $L^2(\Omega_T)$ with radius $R$. Thus, we trivially obtain

$$\|\bar{\rho}_f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_T)} \le \max_l|z_l|\sum_l \|\bar{c}_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_T)} \le LR^2\max_l|z_l|\ .$$

Concerning the second stated estimate, we note that the bound of the time integrals, the diffusion integrals, the convection integrals, and the reaction integrals remain the same as in case 1 above. Only in the estimate for electric drift integral, the bound for the subintegral $B.1$ changes. More precisely, this time we get for the integral $B.1$ with 4.3

$$\begin{aligned}
B.1 &\ge -e(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1}\max_l|z_l|\,\|\bar{\rho}_f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}\sum_l \|c_l\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])}\\
&\ge -e(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1}\max_l|z_l|\,\|\bar{\rho}_f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l+a)\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously to case 1, we obtain after $a \searrow 0$ and $a\ln(c_l + a) \to 0$ the entropy estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l(t_1))\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \frac{\alpha_D}{2}\sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} \\
&\leq \sum_l \|\Lambda(c_{0,l})\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \underbrace{e(\epsilon k_b T)^{-1}\max_l|z_l|\,\|\bar{\rho}_f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}}_{=:b_0}\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l)\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\frac{8}{\alpha_D}\|f\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + \frac{8e^2\max_l|z_l|^2}{\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2}\|\sigma\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + \max_l C_{R_l}}_{=:b}\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l)\|_{L^1(\Omega\times[0,t_1])}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Provided that $\bar{c}_l$ is contained in a ball in $L^\infty(\Omega_T)$ with radius $R$, we have with Gronwall's inequality

$$\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_l)\|_{L^\infty(I;L^1(\Omega))} \leq \Big[1 + (b+b_0)T_0 e^{(b+b_0)T_0}\Big]\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_{0,l})\|_{L^1(\Omega)} =: \tilde{C}_L(T_0,R).$$

Thereby, we finally arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_l \|\sqrt{c_l}\|^2_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} + \frac{\alpha_D}{2}\sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\sqrt{c_l}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega\times[0,t_1])} \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\alpha_D}\Big[1 + (b+b_0)\tilde{C}_L(T_0,R)\Big]\sum_l \|\Lambda(c_{0,l})\|_{L^1(\Omega)} =: C_L(T_0,R).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we prove the crucial energy estimates for the chemical species $c_l$ with the aid of the entropy estimates from Lemma 4.6.

**Lemma 4.7** (Energy estimates)**.** *Let (A1)–(A7) be valid and let $(\boldsymbol{E},\Phi,\boldsymbol{u},p,\boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$ be a weak solution of the system* (2.1a)–(2.1j) *according to Definition 3.1. Then, we have*

$$\sum_l \Big[\|c_l\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} + \|c_l\|_{L^2(I;H^1(\Omega))}\Big] \;\leq\; C_0$$

*Herein, the dependency of the constant is*

$$C_0 = C_0\bigg(C_L, T_0, \max_l|z_l|\,, \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}\,, \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}\,, \|\rho_b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}\,, \|c_{0,l}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\bigg)\,.$$

*Proof.* For ease of readability, we split the proof into two cases. Moreover, in the current proof we use Gagliardo-Nirenberg's inequality in way, which restricts this result to two space dimensions.

Case 1: $n = 2$ and $c_l = \bar{c}_l$ In equations (3.1e), we choose the test functions $\varphi := c_l \in H^1(\Omega)$ and we sum over $l = 1, 2$. Thereby, we get for the time integrals and the diffusion integrals with (A3)

$$\sum_l \langle\theta\partial_t c_l\,,\, c_l\rangle_{1,\Omega} + \sum_l (\mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\nabla}c_l\,,\,\boldsymbol{\nabla}c_l)_\Omega \geq \frac{\theta}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \alpha_D\sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\quad.$$

For the convection integrals, we firstly use integration by parts and we insert equation (3.1d). Secondly, we use Hölder's inequality and Lemma 4.1 with a rescaled free parameter $\delta = \|f\|^{-1}_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}\,\delta$. This leads us to

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\sum_l (c_l\boldsymbol{u}\,,\,\boldsymbol{\nabla}c_l)_\Omega = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_l \big(\boldsymbol{u}\,,\,\boldsymbol{\nabla}c_l^2\big)_\Omega = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_l \big(f\,,\,c_l^2\big)_\Gamma \geq -\frac{1}{2}\sum_l \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}\|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\
&\geq -\delta\sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \;-\; \delta^{-1}\|f\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously, for the electric drift integral we firstly integrate by parts, we insert equation (3.1b). Then, we use Hölder's inequality and Lemma 4.1. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{el} &:= -\frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T}\sum_l \left(z_l c_l \boldsymbol{E}\ ,\ \boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l\right)_\Omega \ = \frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T}\sum_l \frac{z_l}{2}\left[\ \left(\rho_b+\bar{\rho}_f\ ,\ c_l^2\right)_\Omega - \left(\sigma\ ,\ c_l^2\right)_\Gamma\ \right] \\
&\geq \frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T}\sum_l \frac{z_l}{2}\left(\rho_f\ ,\ c_l^2\right)_\Omega - \delta\sum_l |z_l|\,\|\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad - \frac{2e^2}{(\epsilon k_b T)^2}\max_l |z_l|\left[\delta^{-1}\|\sigma\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + \|\rho_b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}\right]\sum_l |z_l|\,\|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&:= I.a + I.b + I.c.
\end{aligned}$$

We now have to bound the integral $I.a$. For that purpose, we apply Hölder's inequality, Gagliardo-Nirenberg's inequality (we have $n=2$) and Young's inequality, which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
I.a &\leq \frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T}\max_l |z_l|\,\|\rho_f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\sum_l \left\|c_l^2\right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T}\max_l |z_l|\,\|\rho_f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^4(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T}\max_l |z_l|\,\|\rho_f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\sum_l \|c_l\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\,\|c_l\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \delta\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} + \frac{e^2}{\delta(\epsilon k_b T)^2}\max_l |z_l|^2\,\|\rho_f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the bound for $I.a$, leads for electric drift integral to

$$I_{el} \geq -\delta\sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} - \frac{2e^2\max_l |z_l|^2}{\delta(\epsilon k_b T)^2}\left[\|\sigma\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + \|\rho_b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)} + \|\rho_f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\right]\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\,.$$

For the reaction integrals, we applying (A5), Young's inequality, and we recall $c_l \geq 0$. This results for the reaction integrals in

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_l \left(\theta R_l(\boldsymbol{c})\ ,\ c_l\right)_\Omega \leq \theta\max_l C_{R_l}\left(|\boldsymbol{c}|\ ,\ \sum_l c_l\right)_\Omega \leq \theta\max_l C_{R_l}\left(\sum_l c_l\ ,\ \sum_l c_l\right)_\Omega \\
&= \theta\max_l C_{R_l}\sum_l \left(c_l\ ,\ c_l\right)_\Omega + \theta\max_l C_{R_l}\sum_{k\neq l}\left(c_k\ ,\ c_l\right)_\Omega \leq 3\theta C_{R_l}\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

By combining the preceding estimates, we deduce with the choice $\delta := \frac{\alpha_D}{4}$ the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\theta}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{\alpha_D}{2}\sum_l \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \frac{12e^2\max_l |z_l|^2}{\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2}\left[\|\sigma\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + \|\rho_b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)} + \|\rho_f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\right]\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \left[\frac{4}{\alpha_D}\|f\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + 3\theta\max_l C_{R_l}\right]\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

With the abbreviations

$$\begin{aligned}
b(t) &:= \frac{12e^2\max_l |z_l|^2}{\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2}\,\|\rho_f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
A_0 &:= \min\left(\frac{\theta}{2}, \frac{\alpha_D}{2}\right) \\
B_0 &:= \frac{12e^2\max_l |z_l|^2}{A_0\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2}\left[\|\sigma\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + \|\rho_b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)} + \|f\|^2_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)} + 3\theta\max_l C_{R_l}\right]\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

we deduce from the preceding estimate with Gronwall's inequality and Lemma 4.6

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} &\leq \exp\left(\int_0^{T_0} B_0 + b(t)\,dt\right) \sum_l \|c_{0,l}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq e^{B_0 T_0} \exp\left(\frac{12e^2 \max_l |z_l|^2}{\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2} \|\rho_f\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_T)}\right) \sum_l \|c_{0,l}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq e^{B_0 T_0} \exp\left(\frac{12e^2 \max_l |z_l|^2}{\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2} C_L^2\right) \sum_l \|c_{0,l}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \ := \hat{C}_0^2(T_0).\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this bound into the above estimate and integrating in time over $[0, T_0]$, yields the desired a priori estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_l \left[\|c_l\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nabla c_l\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}\right] &\leq \hat{C}_0 + B_0^{\frac{1}{2}} T_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_l \|c_l\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} \\ &\leq \hat{C}_0 + B_0^{\frac{1}{2}} T_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{C}_0 \ := C_0(T_0)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $n = 2$ and $c_l \neq \bar{c}_l$ Again, we test equations (3.1e) with $\varphi := c_l \in H^1(\Omega)$ and we run through the same calculations as already carried out in Case 1. The only difference is that we now immediately obtain for the integral $I.a$

$$I.a \leq \frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T} \max_l |z_l| \, \|\bar{\rho}_f\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{e}{\epsilon k_b T} \max_l |z_l|^2 \, \|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \sum_l \|c_l\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

We note, that in Definition 3.1 we introduced the space $X$ and the set $K \subset X$. Furthermore, we supposed $\bar{\boldsymbol{c}} \in K$, which ensures that the $L^\infty$-norms of the $\bar{c}_l$ remain finite. Thus, provided we know $\|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq R$ for all $\bar{\boldsymbol{c}} \in K$, the constant in the above estimate just depends on an additional parameter $R$. In conclusion, we analogously obtain

$$\sum_l \left[\|c_l\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nabla c_l\|_{L^2(\Omega_T)}\right] \leq \hat{C}_0 + B_0^{\frac{1}{2}} T_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{C}_0 \ := C_0(T_0, \|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})\,.$$

Herein, we just changed the definition of the constant $b(t)$ by

$$b(t) := \frac{12e^2 \max_l |z_l|^2}{\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2} \|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{12e^2 \max_l |z_l|^2}{\alpha_D(\epsilon k_b T)^2} \|\bar{\boldsymbol{c}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)} =: b_0\,.$$

□

## 4.2 Existence of a fixed point

For the remaining part of the proof, we can shorty refer to Part 1 of this work, as we wrote Part 1 such that we can direct copy the following parts of the proof. The only difference is, that we subsequently consider $L$ solutes instead of two solutes. Thus, the range of the index $l$ is now $l = 1, \ldots, L$ instead of $l = 1, 2$.

**Lemma 4.8** (Boundedness)**.** *Let (A1)–(A7) be valid and let* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$ *be a weak solution of the system* (2.1a)–(2.1j) *according to Definition 3.1. Then, we have*

$$\sum_l \|c_l\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)} \ \leq \ C_M\,.$$

*Herein, the dependency of the constant is*

$$C_M = C_M\left(C_0, T_0, \max_l |z_l|\,, \|f\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}\,, \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_T)}\,, \|\rho_b\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}\,, \|c_{0,l}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right).$$

*Proof.* The proof is identical to the proof of the corresponding proof of Part 1 of this work. □

**Theorem 4.9** (A priori Bounds)**.** *Let (A1)–(A7) be valid and let* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$ *be a weak solution of* (2.1a)–(2.1j) *according to Definition 2.2. Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Phi\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\boldsymbol{E}\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} \leq C(T_0)\,,\\
&\|p\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} \leq C(T_0)\,,\\
&\sum_l \left[\|c_l\|_{L^\infty(I;L^2(\Omega))} + \|c_l\|_{L^2(I;H^1(\Omega))} + \|c_l\|_{H^1(I;H^1(\Omega)^*)} + \|c_l\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_T)}\right] \leq C(T_0)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof is identical to the corresponding proof of Part 1 of this work. □

**Theorem 4.10.** *Let (A1)–(A7) be valid. Then, there exists a solution* $(\boldsymbol{E}, \Phi, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \boldsymbol{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+2n+L}$ *of equations* (2.1a)–(2.1j) *according to Definition 2.2.*

*Proof.* The proof is identical to the proof of the corresponding proof of Part 1 of this work. □

# 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we showed the global existence of unique solutions of the Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck system. The contribution of this paper was to deal with multicomponent electrolyte solutions, which consist of a neutral solvent and multiple charged solutes $c_l$ with arbitrary valencies. In this situation, the main difficulty was to establish a priori estimates for the chemical species $c_l$. By using entropy estimates, which have been developed for certain Lyapunov functionals, we successfully obtained such a priori estimates. However, these techniques are restricted to two space dimensions, as we combined the entropy estimates with Gagliardo-Nirenberg's inequality in a way, which is valid only in two space dimensions.

In particular, by means of the entropy estimates the presented proof avoids further restrictions on the electrolyte solutions, such as the often used electroneutrality constraint or the volume additivity constraint. Therefore, our results can be applied to two dimensional models of general electrolyte solutions, which are captured by the Darcy–Poisson–Nernst–Planck system. This important especially in biological applications and hydrodynamical applications.

Finally, we note that if we restrict us to electrolyte solutions at rest (in this case the equations (2.1e)–(2.1g) coming from Darcy's law vanish) and linear reaction rates, the presented model in this paper is identical to the considered model in [15], if additionally no constraints are involved in [15]. However, even in this situation we gave a new proof of the same result. More precisely, in [15] the crucial a priori estimates were obtained by involving a two dimensional, nonlinear version of Gagliardo-Nirenberg's inequality from [7], whereas we used the entropy estimates for that purpose.

# Acknowledgements

M. Herz is supported by the Elite Network of Bavaria.

# References

[1] R. Adams and J. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*. 1st ed. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Elsevier Science, 1975.

[2] R. Adams and J. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*. 2nd ed. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Elsevier Science, 2003.

[3] G. Allaire, A. Mikelić, and A. Piatnitski. "Homogenization of the linearized ionic transport equations in rigid periodic porous media." In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 51.12, 123103 (2010). Erratum in Vol. 52, No. 6.

[4] V. Arnold. *Ordinary Differential Equations*. Springer, 1992.

[5] D. Bainov and P. Simeonov. *Integral Inequalities and Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1992.

[6] L. Bedin and M. Thompson. “Existence theory for a Poisson-Nernst-Planck model of electrophoresis.” In: *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.* 12.1 (2013), pp. 157–206.

[7] P. Biler, W. Hebisch, and T. Nadzieja. “The Debye System: Existence and Large Time Behavior of Solutions.” In: *Nonlinear Analysis, Theory, Methods & Applications* 23.9 (1994), pp. 1189–1209.

[8] F. Brezzi and M. Fortin. *Mixed and hybrid finite elements methods*. Springer, 1991.

[9] M. Burger, B. Schlake, and M.-T. Wolfram. “Nonlinear Poisson–Nernst–Planck equations for ion flux through confined geometries.” In: *Nonlinearity* 25.4 (2012), pp. 961–990.

[10] J. A. Carrillo et al. “Entropy Dissipation Methods for Degenerate Parabolic Problems and Generalized Sobolev Inequalities.” In: *Monatshefte für Mathematik* 133.1 (2001), pp. 1–82.

[11] A. Castellanos et al. *Electrohydrodynamics*. Ed. by A. Castellanos. CISM Courses and Lectures. Springer, 1998.

[12] M. Elimelech et al. *Particle Deposition and Aggregation, Measurement, Modeling and Simulation*. Butterworth-Heinemann, 1995.

[13] H. Gajewski. “On Existence, Uniqueness and Asymptotic Behaviour of Solutions of the Basic Equations for Carrier Transport in Semiconductors.” In: *Z. Angew. Math u. Mech* 65.2 (1985), pp. 101–108.

[14] I. Gasser and A. Jüngel. “The quantum hydrodynamic model for semiconductors in thermal equilibrium.” In: *Zeitschrift fur Angewandte Mathematik und Physik* 48.1 (1997), pp. 45–59.

[15] A. Glitzky. “Electro-reaction-diffusion systems with nonlocal constraints.” In: *Mathematische Nachrichten* 277 (2004), pp. 14–46.

[16] M. Herz, N. Ray, and P. Knabner. “Existence and uniqueness of a global weak solution of a Darcy-Nernst-Planck-Poisson system.” In: *GAMM-Mitteilungen* 35.2 (2012), pp. 191–208.

[17] Y. Hyong, B. Eisenberg, and C. Liu. “A mathematical model for hard sphere repulsion in ionic solutions.” In: *Communications in Mathematical Sciences* 9.2 (2011), pp. 459–475.

[18] Jüngel. *Transport Equations for Semiconductors*. Springer, 2009.

[19] S. Kräutle. “Existence of global solutions of multicomponent reactive transport problems with mass action kinetics in porous media.” In: *Journal of Applied Analysis and Computation* 1.4 (2011), pp. 497–515.

[20] L. Landau and E. Lifshitz. *Statistical Physics*. 3rd ed. Vol. 5. Course of Theoretical Physics. Elsevier, 1980.

[21] P. A. Markovich. *The Stationary Semiconductor Device Equations*. Springer, 1986.

[22] J. H. H. Masliyah and S. Bhattacharjee. *Electrokinetic and Colloid Transport Phenomena*. Wiley Interscience, 2006.

[23] A. Mielke. “A gradient structure for the reaction-diffusion system and for the energy-drift-diffusion systems.” In: *Nonlinearity* 24.4 (2011), pp. 1329–1346.

[24] R. F. Probstein. *Physiochemical Hydrodynamics – An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Wiley-Interscience, 2003.

[25] N. Ray, A. Muntean, and P. Knabner. “Rigorous homogenization of a Stokes-Nernst-Planck-Poisson problem for various boundary conditions.” In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 390.1 (2011), pp. 374–393.

[26] T. Roubíček. “Incompressible Fluid Mixtures of Ionized Constitutents.” In: *Trends in Applic. of Math. to Mechanics*. Ed. by Y. Wang and K. Hutter. Shaker, 2005, pp. 429–440.

[27] T. Roubíček. “Incompressible ionized fluid mixtures.” In: *Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics* 17.7 (2006), pp. 493–509.

[28] T. Roubíček. *Nonlinear partial differential Equations with Applications*. Birkhäuser, 2005.

[29] W. Russel, D. Saville, and W. Schowalter. *Colloidal Dispersion*. Cambridge University Press, 1989.

[30] I. Samohýl. “Application of Truesdell’s model of mixture to an ionic liquid mixture.” In: *Comp. and Math. with Appl.* 53.2 (2007), pp. 182–197.

[31] M. Schmuck. “Modeling and deriving porous media Stokes-Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations by a multiple-scale approach.” In: *Comm.Math.Sci.* 9.3 (2011), pp. 685–710.

[32] Z. Schuss, B. Nadler, and R. Eisenberg. “Derivation of Poisson and Nernst-Planck equations in a bath and channel from a molecular model.” In: *Comm.Math.Sci.* 9.3 (2011), pp. 685–710.

[33] D. Willett and J. Wong. “On the discrete analogues of some generalizations of Gronwall’s inequality.” In: *Monatshefte für Mathematik* 69.4 (1965), pp. 362–367.

[34] M.-T. Wolfram, M. Burger, and Z. Siwy. “Mathematical modeling and simulation of nanopore blocking by precipitation.” In: *J. Phys: Condens. Matter* 22.45 (2010), 454101 (6pp).